

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,006	03/26/2004	Michael L. Wilson	400.0010.U1(US)	8992
34070 K P CORREI	7590 04/01/200 L AND ASSOCIATES	EXAM	EXAMINER	
270 BELLEVUE AVE., #326			VO, DON NGUYEN	
NEWPORT, RI 02840			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2611	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/811.006 WILSON ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit Don N. Vo 2611 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2008. 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-18.22 and 23 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4.6-11.13-18.22 and 23 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 5 and 12 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 06 January 2008 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ______.

Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date.

6) Other:

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgment

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment filed on 1/6/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

 Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The claims are drawn to a method for code generation per se. As such, these claims are not directed to one of the statutory categories of invention (See MPEP 2106.01), but are directed to nonstatutory functional descriptive material.

It is noted that computer programs embodied on a computer readable medium or other structure, which would permit the functionality of the program to be realized, would be directed to a product and be within a statutory category of invention, so long as the computer readable medium is not disclosed as non-statutory subject matter per se (signals or carrier waves).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States
- Claims 1-4, 9-11, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Adkisson et al (US 5.257,282).

Regarding claims 1-4, 9-11, 22 and 23, Adkisson, as shown in figures 1-3, teaches method and apparatus for generating a plurality of relatively prime PN codes with each code is separated by a predetermined phase. See also column 2. lines 1-60 and column 3. line 5 to column 6. line 14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior at are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be neadtived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

 Claims 6-8 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adkisson et al (US 5,257,282) in view of Kartchner et al (US 4,638,494; art of record) or Abrahamson et al (5,022,049; art of record).

Regarding claims 6-8 and 13-18, Adkisson teaches all subject matter claimed except for further teaching that the logic combiner comprises MAND, MAJ or MOD logic combiner. However, Kartchner or Abrahamson, from the same field of endeavor, teaches composite PN codes generation using the logic combiner of the MAND, MAJ or MOD types. See Kartchner: figures 1A-2B and Abrahamson: figures 1, and 3-5. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Adkisson et al by using the MAND, MAJ or MOD logic combiner as taught by Kartchner et al or Abrahamson et al so that the composite codes can be generated with a desired correlation properties and thus, enhancing fast acquisition of the composite codes.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 5 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

 Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, 22 and 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

- 11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. References Jha et al (US 2002/0013797) and Niegel et al (US 6,735,239) are cited because they are pertinent to the method and apparatus for PN codes generation.
- 12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Don N. Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3018. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (9:00AM 6:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MOHAMMAD GHAYOUR can be reached on (571) 272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.